

REMARKS

Claims 1-3 and 5-7 remain in this application. Claims 1-3 and 5-7 are rejected. Claims 1 and 5-7 are amended herein to clarify the invention.

Applicant herein traverses and respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of the claims and objection cited in the above-referenced Office Action.

The Office Action indicates that new corrected drawings are required in this application because the screen captures are not considered formal drawings, and are therefore apparently objected to. Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's position, and respectfully submits that the requirement to file a formal drawing replacement for Fig. 5 at this stage of prosecution is contrary to the drawing requirements as set forth in the MPEP at §608.02. It is the applicant's position that the Examiner is misapplying ¶6.21 of that Section, since this paragraph is to be used, as indicated immediately preceding the form paragraph, "[i]f the examiner discovers a defect in the content of the drawing . . ." (Emphasis added), and not merely because a drawing is deemed informal. In such latter instances, the applicant has until payment of the Issue Fee to submit a formal replacement drawing. As further stated in the MPEP, at page 600-91, "[a]n objection will generally only be made to an informal drawing if the Office is unable to reproduce the drawing or the contents of the drawing are unacceptable to the examiner." In the present instance, the Examiner has not identified anything wrong with the contents of Fig. 5, nor has he noted

anything in that regard that would prevent examination or publication. It is therefore respectfully submitted that the Examiner is improperly requiring the preparation of formal drawings, merely because the drawings are considered informal. Thus, applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objection to the drawings, and elects to delay filing corrected formal drawings until subsequent to the receipt of a Notice of Allowability as per PTOL-37 and CFR §1.85(c).

Claims 1-7 (actually claims 1-3 and 5-7) are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Junkin (US 5,860,862). Applicant herein respectfully traverses these rejections.

For a rejection to be sustained under §102(b) each and every element of the claimed invention must be disclosed in the cited prior art reference. It is respectfully submitted that the cited reference fails to disclose at least the following features and elements of the present invention as noted herein.

In accordance with the features of independent claims 1 and 5-7 as amended, users playing a common game can transact game elements directly with each other. Accordingly, the users can transact between themselves without a central server to manage the transaction. Furthermore, the situation of selection of the game element can be displayed at the same time on both display devices. One is the display device of the second game machine for the user to select and acquire the game element, and another is the display device of the first game machine for the user to deliver one of his/her game elements.

Accordingly, in the present invention, for example, after playing a game battle, a game winner can select and acquire a game element directly from the game elements possessed by the game loser, and the game loser can recognize the situation of his/her game element being taken over by the game winner in real time. Since both users playing a common game can have the common experience at the same time and enjoying the game itself, it is further possible to strongly impress the difference between a winner and a loser to the users, and the pleasure of the game can thereby be enhanced.

Contrary to the claimed subject matter, Junkin discloses a central computer as a requisite element (see, for example, Fig. 1A and 1B). Because, the trade is always conducted between the central computer and the interactive device, which is operated by a user (central controller), the trade in Junkin is one between the central computer and the interactive device. Junkin, therefore, fails to disclose and teach a trade which can be conducted directly between the users. Also, Junkin fails to disclose the synchronous display between the users to show the situation of the trade.

Claims 1 and 5-7 are amended and particularly describe and distinctly claim elements not disclosed in the cited reference. Claims 2 and 3 depend from claim 1, and therefore also include the element of claim 1 missing from the cited reference. Therefore, reconsideration of the rejections of claims 1-3 and 5-7 and their allowance are respectfully requested.

Applicant respectfully requests a one (1) month extension of time for responding to the Office Action. Please charge the fee of \$110 for the extension of time to Deposit Account No. 10-1250.

In light of the foregoing, the application is now believed to be in proper form for allowance of all claims and notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. Please charge any deficiency or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 10-1250.

Respectfully submitted,

JORDAN AND HAMBURG LLP

By Frank J. Jordan by:
Frank J. Jordan
Reg. No. 20,456
Attorney for Applicant

Jordan and Hamburg LLP
122 East 42nd Street
New York, New York 10168
(212) 986-2340

Jimmy O. Osh
Reg No. 36,049